arXiv:1410.0187v1 [math.CO] 1 Oct 2014

Disjunctive Total Domination in Graphs

[1]Michael A. Henning* and [1,2]Viroshan Naicker

[1]Department of Mathematics
University of Johannesburg
Auckland Park, 2006 South Africa
Email: mahenning@uj.ac.za

[2]Department of Mathematics
Rhodes University
Grahamstown, 6140 South Africa
Email: V.Naicker@ru.ac.za

Abstract

Let G be a graph with no isolated vertex. In this paper, we study a parameter that is a relaxation of arguably the most important domination parameter, namely the total domination number, $\gamma_t(G)$. A set S of vertices in G is a disjunctive total dominating set of G if every vertex is adjacent to a vertex of S or has at least two vertices in S at distance 2 from it. The disjunctive total domination number, $\gamma_t^d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of such a set. We observe that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t(G)$. We prove that if G is a connected graph of order $n \ge 8$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 2(n-1)/3$ and we characterize the extremal graphs. It is known that if G is a connected claw-free graph of order n, then $\gamma_t(G) \le 2n/3$ and this upper bound is tight for arbitrarily large n. We show this upper bound can be improved significantly for the disjunctive total domination number. We show that if G is a connected claw-free graph of order $n > 10$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4n/7$ and we characterize the graphs achieving equality in this bound.

Keywords: Total dominating set; disjunctive total dominating set; claw-free.
AMS subject classification: 05C69

*Research supported in part by the South African National Research Foundation and the University of Johannesburg

1 Introduction

A major issue in modern networks is to minimize the trade-off between resource allocation and redundancy. Key resources are usually expensive and cannot be allocated across an entire network, and, in addition, if there is a possibility of resource failure at a particular node, redundancy and backup requirements then become vital but require extra resources to be allocated. This problem has been addressed, in various guises, by using graphs as a model for the network and searching for vertex subsets which are 'close' to the rest of the graph and satisfy pertinent redundancy criteria.

Domination and, in particular, total domination are well studied topics in the graph theory literature which attempt a solution of this problem (see, for example, [8, 9, 11, 13]).

Suppose that G is a graph with vertex V that serves as a model of a network. On the one hand, for purposes of resource allocation, we select a set D of vertices, called a *dominating set*, of G such that every vertex in $V \setminus D$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in D. On the other hand, for the purpose of extending the domination problem to include redundancy, we select a set S of vertices, called a *total dominating set* and abbreviated TD-set, of G such that such that every vertex in V, including those in S, is adjacent to at least one vertex in S. However, given the sheer scale of modern networks, many existing domination type structures are expensive to implement. Variations on the theme of dominating and total dominating sets studied to date tend to focus on adding restrictions which in turn raises their implementation costs. As an alternative route a relaxation of the domination number, called *disjunctive domination*, was proposed and studied by Goddard et al. [7]. In this paper we extend this concept to a relaxation of total domination, called *disjunctive total domination*, which allows for greater flexibility in the modeling networks where one trades off redundancy and backup capability with resource optimization.

A set S of vertices in G is a *disjunctive total dominating set*, abbreviated DTD-set, of G if every vertex is adjacent to a vertex of S or has at least two vertices in S at distance 2 from it. For example, the set of five darkened vertices in the graph G shown in Figure 1 is a DTD-set of G. We will say that a vertex v is *disjunctively totally dominated* by a set S if v has a neighbor in S or if v is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S. The *disjunctive total domination number*, $\gamma_t^d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a DTD-set in G. A DTD-set of cardinality $\gamma_t^d(G)$ is called a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set.



Figure 1: A graph G with $\gamma_t^d(G) = 5$.

The *domination number* of G, denoted $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in G, while the *total domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_t(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a TD-set of G. Every TD-set is a DTD-set, implying the following observation.

Observation 1 *For every graph G with no isolated vertex, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t(G)$.*

1.1 Notation

For notation and graph theory terminology, we in general follow [8]. Specifically, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V, edge set E and no isolated vertex. The *open neighborhood* of a vertex $v \in V$ is $N_G(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E(G)\}$ and its *closed neighborhood* is the set $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. The degree of v is $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$. The minimum degree among the vertices of G is denoted by $\delta(G)$. For a set $S \subseteq V$, the subgraph induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$, while the graph obtained from G be removing all vertices in S and their incident edges is denoted by $G - S$. For two vertices u and v in a connected graph G, the *distance* $d_G(u, v)$ between u and v is the length of a shortest u–v path in G. If the graph G is clear from the context, we simply write $N(v)$, $N[v]$ and $d(v)$ rather than $N_G(v)$, $N_G[v]$ and $d_G(v)$, respectively.

For a set $S \subseteq V$, its *open neighborhood* is the set $N(S) = \cup_{v \in S} N(v)$ and its *closed neighborhood* is the set $N[S] = N(S) \cup S$. For sets $A, B \subseteq V$, we say that A *totally dominates* B if $B \subseteq N(A)$. A *cycle* and *path* on n vertices are denoted by C_n and P_n, respectively.

For a graph H and integer $k \geq 1$, we denote by $H \circ P_k$ the graph of order $(k+1)|V(H)|$ obtained from H by attaching a path of length k to each vertex of H so that the resulting paths are vertex-disjoint. The graph $H \circ P_2$ is also called the 2-*corona* of H.

A *leaf* is a vertex of degree 1 and a *support vertex* is a vertex adjacent to a leaf. A *star* is a tree $K_{1,n}$, while for integers $r, s \geq 1$, a *double star* $S(r, s)$ is a tree with exactly two vertices that are not leaves, one of which has degree $r + 1$ and the other degree $s + 1$. A *rooted tree* distinguishes one vertex r called the *root*. For each vertex $v \neq r$ of T, the *parent* of v is the neighbor of v on the unique r–v path, while a *child* of v is any other neighbor of v.

1.2 Known Results

Cockayne, Dawes, and Hedetniemi [2] proved that the total domination number of a connected graph of order at least 3 is bounded above by two-thirds its order. The graphs achieving equality in this bound were characterized by Brigham, Carrington, and Vitray [1]. If we restrict G to be a connected claw-free graph, then this upper bound of two-thirds the order of the graph cannot be improved since the 2-corona of a complete graph is claw-free and has total domination number two-thirds its order.

Theorem 2 ([1, 2]) *If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t(G) \leq 2n/3$. Further, this bound is sharp even if we restrict our attention to the class of claw-free graphs.*

Let C'_{10} be the graph obtained from a 10-cycle $v_1v_2 \ldots v_{10}v_1$ by adding the edge v_1v_6 and let C''_{10} be the graph obtained from C'_{10} by adding the edge v_2v_7. If we restrict the minimum degree to be two and impose the additional restriction that the graph is connected, the upper bound on the total domination number can be improved as follows.

Theorem 3 ([10]) *If $G \notin \{C_3, C_5, C_6, C_{10}, C'_{10}, C''_{10}\}$ is a connected graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then $\gamma_t(G) \leq 4n/7$.*

The total domination number of a connected graph on seven vertices is at most 4. It is a simple exercise to check that there are exactly 20 such graphs with total domination number 4. Of these 20 graphs, 12 are claw-free and belong to the family $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_{12}\}$ shown in Figure 2. Hence we have the following observation. Note that $L_1 = P_7$ and $L_{10} = C_7$.



Figure 2: The 12 claw-free graphs on 7 vertices with total domination number 4.

Observation 4 *Let G be a connected claw-free graph of order $n = 7$. Then, $\gamma_t(G) \leq 4$ with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{L}$.*

A graph G is referred to in [10] as a $\frac{4}{7}$-*minimal graph* if G is edge-minimal with respect to satisfying the following three conditions: (i) $\delta(G) \geq 2$, (ii) G is connected, and (iii) $\gamma_t(G) \geq 4n/7$, where n is the order of G. The $\frac{4}{7}$-minimal graphs are characterized in [10]. As a consequence of this characterization and of the main result in [10] which characterizes the connected graphs G of order $n > 14$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$ achieving the upper bound of Theorem 3, one can readily obtain the following result.

Corollary 5 *Let G be a connected claw-free graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. If $G \notin \{C_3, C_5, C_6, C_{10}\}$, then $\gamma_t(G) \leq 4n/7$. Further if $\gamma_t(G) = 4n/7$, then $G \in \{L_{10}, L_{11}, L_{12}, C_{14}\}$.*

1.3 Special Families

For $k \geq 1$, let T_k be the tree obtained from a star $K_{1,k}$ by subdividing every edge exactly twice and let $\mathcal{T}$ be the family of all such trees T_k. For $k \geq 2$, let G_k be the graph obtained

from T_k by adding an edge joining two neighbors of the central vertex of T_k, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the family of all such graphs G_k. Finally for $k \geq 2$, let F_k be the tree obtained from T_k by deleting an edge uv incident with the central vertex v of T_k and adding the edge uw for some neighbor w of v different from u, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of all such trees F_k. Let T^* be the tree obtained from a star $K_{1,3}$ by subdividing one edge three times, and so T^* has order 7. The graph G_4 and the trees T_4, F_4 and T^* are illustrated in Figure 3.



Figure 3: The graph G_4 and the trees T_4, F_4 and T^*.

Let H_t be the claw-free graph obtained from a complete graph K_t on $t \geq 1$ vertices as follows: For each vertex v of the complete graph K_t, add a path P_6 and join v to the two central vertices of the path. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the family of all such graphs H_t, where $t \geq 1$. The graph $H_3 \in \mathcal{H}$ is illustrated in Figure 4.



Figure 4: The graph H_3.

2 Results

Our aim in this paper is twofold. First to establish a tight upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number of a graph in terms of its order and to characterize the extremal graphs. Secondly to show that this bound can be significantly improved if we impose the condition of claw-freeness on a graph. The following result establishes an upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number of a graph of order at least 8 and characterizes the graphs achieving equality in this bound. A proof of Theorem 6 is given in Section 2.2.

Theorem 6 *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$.*

Total domination in claw-free graphs is well studied in the literature, see for example [3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16] and elsewhere. We show next that if we impose the condition of claw-

freeness on a graph, then the upper bound in Theorem 2 can be improved significantly from approximately two-thirds its order to four-sevenths its order. For this purpose, let $\mathcal{E} = \{P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6, C_3, G_3\}$. We call a graph in the family $\mathcal{E}$ an "exceptional graph". Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, L_5, L_6, L_{10}\}$ and let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \{L_{13}, L_{14}\}$, where L_{13} and L_{14} are the graphs shown in Figure 5.



(a) L_{13} (b) L_{14}

Figure 5: The graphs L_{13} and L_{14}.

Theorem 7 *Let G be a connected claw-free graph of order $n \geq 2$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4n/7$, unless $G \in \mathcal{E}$. Further if $G \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4n/7$, then $G \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{S}$.*

A proof of Theorem 7 is given in Section 3. Since the graphs in the family $\mathcal{E}$ all have order at most 10 and the graphs in the family $\mathcal{S}$ all have order at most 14, our second main result, namely Theorem 8, follows as an immediate consequence of Theorem 7.

Theorem 8 *If G is a connected claw-free graph of order $n > 14$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4n/7$, with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{H}$.*

2.1 Preliminary Results and Observations

Since adding edges to a graph cannot increase its disjunctive total domination number, we have the following observation.

Observation 9 *If H is a spanning subgraph of a graph G, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H)$.*

The following lemma will prove to be useful.

Lemma 10 *If v is a support vertex in a graph G with exactly one neighbor w that is not a leaf, then there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set that contains v. Further if $d_G(w) = 2$, then there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set that contains both v and w.*

Proof. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. If $v \notin S$, then in order to disjunctively totally dominate the leaf neighbors of v, at least two leaf neighbors of v belong to S. But we can simply replace one of the leaf neighbors of v in S with the vertex v. Hence the set S can be chosen to contain v. Further if $d_G(w) = 2$ and $w \notin S$, then at least one leaf neighbor of v belongs to S in order to totally dominate or disjunctively totally dominate v. But we can simply replace such a leaf neighbor of v in S with the vertex w. □

The total domination number of a path P_n or a cycle C_n on $n \geq 3$ vertices is easy to compute (see, [10]): For $n \geq 3$, $\gamma_t(C_n) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + \lceil n/4 \rceil - \lfloor n/4 \rfloor$. However if we disjunctively total dominate the vertices of a path or cycle we can do much better. We first establish the value of $\gamma_t^d(C_n)$ for a cycle C_n.

Proposition 11 *For $n \geq 3$, $\gamma_t^d(C_n) = 2n/5$ if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(C_n) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n \geq 3$. The result is straightforward to verify for $n \leq 9$. Suppose that $n \geq 10$ and that the result is true for all cycles of order less than n. Let G be a cycle on n vertices given by $v_1 v_2 \ldots v_n v_1$. We first establish upper bounds on $\gamma_t^d(G)$. Let

$$S = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/5 \rfloor - 1} \{v_{5i+1}, v_{5i+2}\}.$$

If $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, let $D = S$. If $n \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, let $D = S \cup \{v_n\}$. If $n \equiv i \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ where $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, let $D = S \cup \{v_{n-4}, v_{n-3}\}$. In all cases, the set D is a DTD-set of G. Further if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $|D| = 2n/5$, while if $n \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $|D| = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(C_n) \leq 2n/5$ if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(C_n) \leq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ if $n \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$.

To prove the reverse inequality, let T be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. If no two vertices in T are adjacent, then n is even and either T contains all vertices with even subscripts or all vertices with odd subscripts. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| = n/2$. Since $n \geq 10$, this contradicts our earlier upper bounds established on $\gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence the set T contains two consecutive vertices on the cycle. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq T$. We show next that we can choose T so that $T \cap \{v_3, v_4, v_5\} = \emptyset$.

Suppose that $v_3 \in T$. If $v_4 \in T$, let i be the smallest integer such that $i \geq 5$ and $v_i \notin T$, and replace v_3 in T with the vertex v_i. Suppose that $v_4 \notin T$. If $v_5 \in T$, replace v_3 in T with v_4. If $v_5 \notin T$ and $v_6 \in T$, replace v_3 in T with v_5. If $v_5 \notin T$ and $v_6 \notin T$, then $v_7 \in T$ and replace v_3 in T with v_6. In all the above cases, we can choose T so that $v_3 \notin T$.

Suppose that $v_4 \in T$. If $v_5 \notin T$, then $v_6 \in T$ and we can replace v_4 in T with the vertex v_5. If $v_5 \in T$, let i be the smallest integer such that $i \geq 6$ and $v_i \notin T$, and replace v_4 in T with the vertex v_i. In both cases we can choose T so that $v_4 \notin T$.

Suppose that $v_5 \in T$. Then, $v_6 \in T$. Let i be the smallest integer such that $i \geq 7$ and $v_i \notin T$, and replace v_5 in T with the vertex v_i. Hence we can choose T so that $v_5 \notin T$. Therefore, $T \cap \{v_3, v_4, v_5\} = \emptyset$, implying that $\{v_6, v_7\} \subset T$. Let $T' = T \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$, and note that $|T'| = |T| - 2$.

We now let G' be obtained from G by deleting the vertices v_i, $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and adding the edge $v_6 v_n$. Then, $G' = C_{n'}$, where $n' = n - 5 \geq 5$. Since T is a DTD-set of G, the set T' is a DTD-set of G'. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq |T'| = |T| - 2$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to G', we have that $\gamma_t^d(G') = 2n'/5 = 2n/5 - 2$ if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G') = \lceil 2(n'+1)/5 \rceil = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil - 2$ if $n \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. This implies that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| \geq 2n/5$ if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$

and $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| \geq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ if $n \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. The desired bounds now follow as a consequence of the upper bounds on $\gamma_t^d(G)$ established earlier. □

We next establish the value of $\gamma_t^d(P_n)$ for a path P_n. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 11 and is omitted.

Proposition 12 *For $n \geq 3$, $\gamma_t^d(P_n)) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil + 1$ if $n \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(P_n) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise.*

We remark that if G, for example, is a cycle C_n where $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 15)$, then $\gamma(G) = n/3$ while $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2n/5$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) - \gamma(G) = n/15$, which can be made arbitrarily large for sufficiently large n. On the other hand, if G is obtained from $K_{2,k+2}$, where $k \geq 1$, by adding a pendant edge to each vertex of degree 2 and adding an edge joining the two vertices of degree $k+2$, then $\gamma(G) = k+2$ while $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2$, implying that $\gamma(G) - \gamma_t^d(G) = k$, which can be made arbitrarily large for sufficiently large k. Hence we have the following result.

Observation 13 *There is no relationship between the domination number γ and the disjunctive total domination γ_t^d of a graph in the sense that for every positive integer k, there exist graphs G and H such that $\gamma_t^d(G) - \gamma(G) \geq k$ and $\gamma(H) - \gamma_t^d(H) \leq k$.*

2.2 Proof of Theorem 6

In order to prove Theorem 6, we first establish an upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number of a tree in terms of its order and we characterize the extremal trees.

Theorem 14 *Let $T \notin \{P_5, P_6\}$ be a tree of order $n \geq 4$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_{1,3}, T^*\}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the order $n \geq 4$ of a tree $T \notin \{P_5, P_6\}$ to show that $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$. Furthermore, if equality holds, then $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_{1,3}, T^*\}$. If $n = 4$, then $T = P_4 \in \mathcal{T}$ or $T = K_{1,3}$. In both cases, $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2 = 2(n-1)/3$. If $n = 5$, then $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2 < 2(n-1)/3$ (recall that $T \neq P_5$, by assumption). If $n = 6$, then $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 3 < 2(n-1)/3$ (recall that $T \neq P_6$, by assumption). Hence we may assume that $n \geq 7$.

If T is a star or a double star, then $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2 < 2(n-1)/3$. Hence we may assume that $\mathrm{diam}(T) \geq 4$. Let P be a longest path in T and let P be an r-u path. Necessarily, both r and u are leaves. We now root the tree at the vertex r. Let v be the parent of u, and let w be the parent of v and x the parent of w in the rooted tree. We proceed further with the following series of claims. Recall that $n \geq 7$.

Claim I. *If $d_T(v) \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $T = T^* \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d_T(v) \geq 3$. Let $T' = T - u$. Let T' have order n', and so $n' = n-1 \geq 6$. We note that v is a support vertex in T' with exactly one neighbor that is not a leaf. By Lemma 10, there is a $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set S' that contains v. If $T' = P_6$, then $T = T^*$, and we are done. Hence we may assume that $T' \neq P_6$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to T', we have that $\gamma_t^d(T') \leq 2(n'-1)/3 = 2(n-2)/3$, with equality if and only if $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{T^*\}$. Since S' is a DTD-set in T, we have that $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq |S'| \leq 2(n-2)/3 < 2(n-1)/3$. (□)

By Claim I, we may assume that $d_T(v) = 2$, for otherwise the desired result follows. Analogously we may assume that every (support) vertex at distance $\mathrm{diam}(T) - 1$ from r in T has degree 2 in T.

Claim II. *If $d_T(w) \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $T = F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d_T(w) \geq 3$. Let $T' = T - \{u, v\}$ have order n'. Then, $n' = n - 2 \geq 5$. If $T' \in \{P_5, P_6\}$, then either $T = F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ or $\gamma_t^d(T) < 2(n-1)/3$, and we are done. Hence we may assume that $T' \notin \{P_5, P_6\}$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to T', we have that $\gamma_t^d(T') \leq 2(n'-1)/3 = 2(n-3)/3$, with equality if and only if $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{T^*\}$. We proceed further with the following subclaim.

Claim II.1. *There is a $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set that contains w or two neighbors of w in T'.*

Proof. If w has a leaf-neighbor w' in T', then every $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set contains w or two neighbors of w in T' different from w' in order to disjunctively totally dominate the leaf w'. Hence we may assume that w has no leaf-neighbor in T', for otherwise the desired result follows. Then, $d_{T'}(w) \geq 2$ and every neighbor of w different from its parent x is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. Let v' be a child of w in T' and let u' be the child of v'. By Lemma 10, there is a $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set S' that contains v'. If $u' \in S'$, then we simply replace u' in S' by w. Hence in order to disjunctively totally dominate the vertex v', we have that $w \in S'$ or S' contains two neighbors of w in T' different from v'. Thus the set S' can be chosen to contain w or two neighbors of w in T', as desired. (□)

By Claim II.1, there is a $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set that contains w or two neighbors of w in T'. Let S' be such a set. Then the set $S' \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set in T, and so $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq |S'| + 1 \leq 2(n-3)/3 + 1 < 2(n-1)/3$. This completes the proof of Claim II. (□)

By Claim II, we may assume that $d_T(w) = 2$, for otherwise the desired result follows. Analogously we may assume that every vertex at distance $\mathrm{diam}(T) - 2$ from r in T has degree 2 in T. Let $T' = T - \{u, v, w\}$ have order n'. Then, $n' = n - 3 \geq 4$.

Suppose $n' = 4$, and so $n = 7$. If $T' = K_{1,3}$, then either x is the central vertex of T', in which case $\gamma_t^d(T) = 3 < 2(n-1)/3$, or x is a leaf of T', in which case $T = T^*$. If $T' = P_4$, then either x is a central vertex of T', in which case $T = F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, or x is a leaf of T', in

which case $T = P_7 \in \mathcal{T}$. Hence we may assume that $n' \geq 5$, for otherwise the desired result follows. If $T' = P_5$, then $n = 8$ and $\gamma_t^d(T) = 4 < 2(n-1)/3$. If $T' = P_6$, then $n = 9$ and $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 5 < 2(n-1)/3$. Hence we may assume that $T' \notin \{P_5, P_6\}$ (and still $n' \geq 5$). Applying the inductive hypothesis to T', we have that $\gamma_t^d(T') \leq 2(n'-1)/3 = 2(n-4)/3$, with equality if and only if $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{T^*\}$. Every $\gamma_t^d(T')$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of T by adding to it the vertices v and w, implying that

$$\gamma_t^d(T) \leq \gamma_t^d(T') + 2 \leq \frac{2}{3}(n'-1) + 2 = \frac{2}{3}(n-1). \tag{1}$$

This establishes the desired upper bound. Suppose that $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2(n-1)/3$. Then we must have equality throughout the Inequality Chain (1). In particular, $\gamma_t^d(T') = 2(n'-1)/3$, implying that $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{T^*\}$ (recall that $n' \geq 5$). If $T' = T^*$, then $n = 10$ and irrespective of which vertex of T' corresponds to the vertex x, we have that $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 5 < 2(n-1)/3$, a contradiction. Hence, $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$.

Suppose $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, $T' = T_k$ for some $k \geq 2$, and so $n = 3k + 4$. If x is a leaf of T' or if x is a support vertex of T', then $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2k + 1 < 2(n-1)/3$, a contradiction. If x is the central vertex of T', then $T = T_{k+1} \in \mathcal{T}$. If x is adjacent to the central vertex of T', then $T = F_{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence we may assume that $T' \in \mathcal{F}$, for otherwise if $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, then $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, as desired. Thus, $T' = F_k$ for some $k \geq 2$. It is now a routine exercise to check that if x is not the central vertex of T', then $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2k + 1 < 2(n-1)/3$, a contradiction. Hence, x is the central vertex of T', implying that $T = F_{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Conversely, suppose that $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{K_{1,3}, T^*\}$. If $T \in \{K_{1,3}, P_4, T^*\}$, then it is a simple exercise to check that $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2(n-1)/3$. Suppose, therefore, that $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$ has order $n \geq 7$. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(T)$-set. If $T = T_k \in \mathcal{T}$ or if $T = F_k \in \mathcal{F}$, then by Lemma 10 and its proof the set S can be chosen to contain all k support vertices of T and their k neighbors that are not leaf-neighbors, and so $\gamma_t^d(T) = |S| \geq 2(n-1)/3$. As shown earlier, $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$ for all trees T of order $n \geq 4$ different from P_5 and P_6. Consequently, $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2(n-1)/3$. This completes the proof of Theorem 14. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 14, we have the following result.

Corollary 15 *If T is a tree of order $n \geq 8$, then $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$.*

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 6. Recall its statement.

Theorem 6 *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$. If G is a tree, then by Corollary 15 we have that $G \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, as desired. Hence we may assume that G is not a tree. Among all spanning trees of G, let T be chosen so that $\gamma_t^d(T)$ is a minimum. By Observation 9, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(T)$. By Corollary 15, $\gamma_t^d(T) \leq 2(n-1)/3$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n-1)/3$.

Suppose that $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2(n-1)/3$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(T) = 2(n-1)/3$. By our choice of T and by Corollary 15, this implies that every spanning tree T' of G satisfies $\gamma_t^d(T') = 2(n-1)/3$ and therefore belongs to the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$. In particular, we note that $n \geq 10$ and $n \equiv 1 \pmod 3$. Let $e \in E(G) \setminus E(T)$.

Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, $T = T_k$ for some integer $k \geq 3$. If e joins a leaf of T to the central vertex of T, then deleting the cycle edge in $T + e$ that is not incident to either end of e (and therefore joins two vertices of degree 2 in T) produces a spanning tree of G that does not belong to the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction. Hence we may assume that e does not join a leaf of T to the central vertex of T. If e does not join two neighbors of the central vertex in T, then deleting a cycle edge of $T + e$ different from e produces a spanning tree of G that does not belong to the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction. Thus the edge e joins two neighbors of the central vertex in T, and so $T + e = G_k \in \mathcal{G}$. This is true for every edge in $E(G) \setminus E(T)$. Suppose that there is an edge $f \in E(G) \setminus (E(T) \cup \{e\})$. Let e' be a cycle edge in $T + e$ different from e, and let f' be a cycle edge in $T + f$ different from e and e'. Then, the tree $(T + \{e, f\}) - \{e', f'\}$ obtained from $T + \{e, f\}$ by deleting the two edges e' and f' produces a spanning tree of G that does not belong to the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction. Therefore, e is the only edge of G not in T, implying that $G = T + e = G_k \in \mathcal{G}$, as desired.

Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, $T = F_k$ for some integer $k \geq 3$. Let v denote the vertex of T that is at distance at least 3 from every leaf of T and let u denote the vertex at distance 2 from v in T that is not a support vertex in T. If e does not join u and v, then deleting a cycle edge in $T + e$ different from e produces a spanning tree of G that does not belong to the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction. Hence the edge e must join u and v, implying that $E(G) \setminus E(T) = \{e\}$ and $G = T + e = G_k \in \mathcal{G}$, as desired. □

3 Claw-Free Graphs

In this section, we determine a tight upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number of a claw-free graph. For this purpose, we first present some preliminary results and observations. Recall that the family $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_{12}\}$ consists of the 12 connected claw-free graphs on seven vertices with total domination number 4. Of these 12 graphs, six have disjunctive total domination number 4, namely the graphs in the family $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, L_5, L_6, L_{10}\}$. Hence since $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t(G)$ for all graphs G with no isolated vertex, we have the following observation.

Observation 16 *If G is a connected claw-free graph of order 7, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4$ with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$.*

As a consequence of Corollary 5, we have the following result.

Observation 17 *If G is a connected claw-free graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$, unless $G \in \{C_3, C_7\}$.*

We remark that every graph of order $n \geq 8$ in the family $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ contains a claw, except for the graph G_3. Hence we have the following immediate consequence of Theorem 6.

Corollary 18 *If G is a connected claw-free graph of order $n \geq 8$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2n/3 - 1$, unless $G = G_3$.*

Recall that the set of exceptional graphs is the set $\mathcal{E} = \{P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6, C_3, G_3\}$. We shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 19 *Let G be a connected claw-free graph of order n, where $2 \leq n \leq 11$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4n/7$, unless $G \in \mathcal{E}$. Further if $G \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4n/7$, then $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$.*

Proof. If $n = 2$, then $G = P_2$, while if $n = 3$, then $G \in \{P_3, C_3\}$. If $n = 4$, then $\gamma_t(G) = 2 < 4n/7$. If $n = 5$, then either $G = P_5$ or $\gamma_t(G) = 2 < 4n/7$. If $n = 6$, then either $G = P_6$ or $\gamma_t(G) \leq 3 < 4n/7$. Since $\{P_2, P_3, P_5, P_6, C_3\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and since $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t(G)$, it therefore follows that for $2 \leq n \leq 6$ either $G \in \mathcal{E}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$. If $n = 7$, then by Observation 16, we have $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4$ with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Suppose $8 \leq n \leq 11$. If $G = G_3$, then G is an exceptional graph in the family $\mathcal{E}$. Hence we may assume that $G \neq G_3$. By Corollary 18, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \lfloor 2n/3 \rfloor - 1$. Since $\lfloor 2n/3 \rfloor - 1 < 4n/7$ for all values of $n \in \{8, 9, 10, 11\}$, we therefore have that $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$. □

We are now in a position to present a proof of Theorem 7. Recall its statement.

Theorem 7 *Let G be a connected claw-free graph of order $n \geq 2$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4n/7$, unless $G \in \mathcal{E}$. Further if $G \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4n/7$, then $G \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $n \geq 2$. If $n \leq 11$, then the desired result follows from Lemma 19. This establishes the base cases. Let $n \geq 12$ and assume the result holds for all connected claw-free graph of order n', where $2 \leq n' < n$, and let G be a connected claw-free graph of order n.

If $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then by Observation 17 (and recalling that $n \geq 12$), we have $\gamma_t(G) < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that G has a vertex of degree 1, for otherwise there is nothing left to prove. Let y be a leaf and x its neighbor. Let $X = N[x] \setminus \{y\}$. By the claw-freeness of G, the set X is a clique. We call a component of $G - X$ a fragment. A fragment isomorphic to a graph F, we call an F-fragment. For each fragment F we choose a vertex $x_F \in X$ that is adjacent to a vertex of F. If w is a chosen vertex in X associated with a fragment F, then $w = x_F$ and we denote the fragment F by F_w. By the claw-freeness of G, every vertex in X is adjacent to vertices from at most one fragment. The chosen vertices, x_F, associated with a fragment are therefore distinct.

Let X_1 be those vertices in X that are not one of the chosen vertices, x_F, where $F \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus if $v \in X_1$, then either v is not a chosen vertex associated with a fragment or $v = v_F$ for some fragment F where $F \notin \mathcal{E}$. Let Y be the set consisting of the vertices of the P_1-fragments together with set X_1. In particular, we note that $\{x, y\} \subseteq Y$, and so $|Y| \geq 2$. Further if $|Y| \geq 3$, then $|X_1| \geq 2$.

We proceed further with the following algorithm. The algorithm carefully selects a set S of vertices of G depending on the structure of the fragments in $G - X$. The resulting set S is chosen in such a way that it is either a DTD-set of G or can be extended to a DTD-set of G. In both cases, the resulting TDT-set of G has cardinality at most four-sevenths the order of G.

Algorithm A. *Let S be the set of vertices in G constructed as follows. Initially, set $S = \emptyset$. Let F be a fragment of G.*

1. *If $|Y| \geq 4$, then add to S the vertex x and one other vertex of X_1.*
2. *If $|Y| = 2$ or if $|Y| = 3$, then add to S the vertex x.*
3. *If $F \neq P_1$ and $F \notin \mathcal{E}$, then add to S a $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set.*
4. *If $F = P_2$, do the following.*
   - 4.1. *If both vertices of F are adjacent to x_F, then add x_F to S.*
   - 4.2. *If exactly one vertex of F is adjacent to x_F, then add this vertex of F to S.*
5. *If $F = P_3$, do the following.*
   - 5.1. *If x_F is adjacent to the central vertex of F, then add the vertex x_F and a neighbor of x_F in F to S.*
   - 5.2. *If x_F is not adjacent to the central vertex, then by the claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is adjacent to exactly one leaf of F. Add the leaf of F adjacent to x_F and the central vertex of F to S.*
6. *If $F = C_3$, then add to S the vertex x_F and a neighbor of x_F in F.*
7. *If $F = P_5$, let $v_1v_2 \ldots v_5$ denote the path F.*
   - 7.1. *If x_F is adjacent to a leaf of F, say to v_1, then add x_F, v_3 and v_4 to S.*
   - 7.2. *If x_F is not adjacent to a leaf of F, then by the claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is adjacent to v_3 and to at least one of v_2 and v_4, say to v_2 by symmetry. In this case, add x_F, v_3 and v_4 to S.*
8. *If $F = P_6$, let $v_1v_2 \ldots v_6$ denote the path F.*
   - 8.1. *If x_F is adjacent to a leaf of F, say to v_1, then add x_F, v_4 and v_5 to S.*
   - 8.2. *If x_F is not adjacent to a leaf of F but adjacent to a support vertex of F, say to v_2, then by the claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is also adjacent to v_3. In this case, add v_2, v_4 and v_5 to S.*
   - 8.3. *If x_F is adjacent to neither a leaf nor a support vertex of F, then by the claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is adjacent to both v_3 and v_4. In this case, add x_F, v_2, v_4 and v_5 to S.*
9. *If $F = G_3$, let $V(F) = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, v_1, v_2, v_3, w, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, where w is the central vertex of F, and for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{u_i, v_i, w_i\}$ is the set of three vertices at distance i from w in F, where $u_1u_2u_3$, $v_1v_2v_3$ and $w_1w_2w_3$ are paths and where u_1 and v_1 are adjacent. Let $D = \{x_F, u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2\}$.*
   - 9.1. *If x_F is adjacent to w_3, then add $(D \setminus \{w_1, w_2\}) \cup \{w_3\}$ to S.*
   - 9.2. *If x_F is not adjacent to w_3 but to u_3 or v_3, say to u_3, then add $(D \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}) \cup \{u_3\}$ to S.*
   - 9.3. *If x_F is adjacent to no leaf of F but is adjacent to w_2, then add $D \setminus \{w_2\}$ to S.*
   - 9.4. *If x_F is adjacent to neither a leaf of F nor to w_2 but is adjacent to u_2 or v_2, say to u_2, then add $D \setminus \{u_2\}$ to S.*
   - 9.5. *Suppose x_F is adjacent to neither a leaf nor a support vertex of F. By the*

claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is adjacent to w.

9.5.1. If x_F is adjacent to w_1, then add $(D \setminus \{u_1, w_1\}) \cup \{w\}$ to S.

9.5.2. If x_F is not adjacent to w_1, then by the claw-freeness of G the vertex x_F is adjacent to both u_1 and v_1, and we add $(D \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}) \cup \{w\}$ to S.

We make a few comments about Algorithm A. In Step 3 of the algorithm, the $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set added to S has cardinality at most $4|V(F)|/7$ by the inductive hypothesis. Further if it has cardinality exactly $4|V(F)|/7$, then $F \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{S}$. In Step 8.3 we note that $G[V(F) \cup \{x_F\}] = H_1$. In Step 9, we note that the set added to S is a 6-element subset of $V(F) \cup \{x_F\}$. In Step 3 to Step 9, we note that the added set contains the vertex x_F, except in Steps 4.2, 5.2, and 8.2. We note that $x \in S$. Let F_y be the P_1-fragment that consists of the vertex y. We proceed further with a series of claims.

Claim A *If $|S \cap X| \geq 2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose that the set S contains at least two vertices of X. Then by construction the set S is a DTD-set of G. Furthermore in this case the set S is guaranteed to have cardinality strictly less than $4n/7$. □

By Claim A, we may assume that $S \cap X = \{x\}$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ and we are done. This implies that the graph G has the following properties.

Claim B *Let F be a fragment in G. Then the following holds.*

(a) $|Y| \leq 3$.

(b) *There is at most one fragment F such that $F \neq P_1$ and $F \notin \mathcal{E}$.*

(c) $F \in \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_6\}$ *or* $F \notin \mathcal{E}$.

(d) *If F is a P_1-fragment, then $F = F_y$.*

(e) *If F is a P_2-fragment, then exactly one vertex of F is adjacent to x_F.*

(f) *If F is a P_3-fragment, then a leaf, but no other vertex, of F is adjacent to x_F.*

(g) *If F is a P_6-fragment, then x_F is adjacent to a support vertex, but not a leaf, of F.*

Claim C *If there is a P_6-fragment, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose there is a P_6-fragment, F. By Claim B(g), x_F is adjacent to a support vertex, but not a leaf, of F. Let $v_1v_2 \ldots v_6$ be the path F. We may assume, renaming vertices if necessary, that the vertex x_F is adjacent to v_2 and v_3. Recall that in Step 8.2 of Algorithm A, we added v_2, v_4 and v_5 to S. We now let $S^* = S \cup \{x_F\}$. By construction the resulting set S^* is a DTD-set of G since note that $\{x, x_F\} \subset S^*$. For each fragment L in G different from F_y, we let $V_L = V(L) \cup \{x_L\}$ and note that $|S^* \cap V_L| \leq 4|V_L|/7$. Further we note that $|Y| \in \{2, 3\}$ but $S^* \cap Y = \{x\}$, implying that $|S^* \cap Y| < 4|Y|/7$. Hence the DTD-set S^* is guaranteed to have cardinality strictly less than $4n/7$. □

By Claim C, we may assume that there is no P_6-fragment, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ and we are done. Hence by Claim B, if F is a fragment different from F_y, then F is a

P_2-fragment or a P_3-fragment or $F \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $F \neq P_1$. For $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, let k_i denote the number of P_i-fragments in G. By Claim B(c), $k_1 = 1$.

Claim D *If every fragment in G different from F_y belongs to $\mathcal{E}$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose that every fragment in G different from F_y belongs to $\mathcal{E}$. Let F be a fragment different from F_y. Then, $F \in \{P_2, P_3\}$. Recall that $k_1 = 1$ and that $n \geq 12$, implying that $k_2 + k_3 \geq 3$. If $k_2 = 0$, then $k_3 \geq 3$ and the set S is a DTD-set of G. Further, $|S| = 2k_3 + 1$ and $n = 4k_3 + |Y| \geq 4k_3 + 2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| \leq n/2 < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that $k_2 \geq 1$. In this case, we select one P_2-fragment F of G and consider the set $S^* = S \cup \{x_F\}$. Since $\{x, x_F\} \subset S^*$, we note that S^* is a DTD-set of G. Further, $|S^*| = k_2 + 2k_3 + 2$. Since $n = 3k_2 + 4k_3 + |Y| \geq 3k_2 + 4k_3 + 2$, we have that $4n/7 \geq k_2 + 2k_3 + 2 + 5k_2/7 + 2k_3/7 - 6/7$. Since $k_2 \geq 2$ or $k_2 = 1$ and $k_3 \geq 2$, we note that $5k_2/7 + 2k_3/7 - 6/7 > 0$, implying that $4n/7 > k_2 + 2k_3 + 2 = |S^*| \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence if every fragment in G different from F_y belongs to $\mathcal{E}$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$. □

By Claim D, we may assume that there is a fragment F in G such that $F \neq F_y$ and $F \notin \mathcal{E}$. For notational convenience, let $w = x_F$ and let F_w denote this fragment F. Since $\{w, x, y\} \subseteq Y$, we have by Claim B(a) that $Y = \{w, x, y\}$. Further by Claim B(b), F_w is the only fragment different from F_y that does not belong to $\mathcal{E}$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\gamma_t^d(F_w) \leq 4|V(F_w)|/7$ with equality if and only if $F_w \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{S}$. All remaining fragments, if any, different from F_w and F_y are P_2- or P_3-fragments.

Claim E *If $k_2 \geq 1$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose that $k_2 \geq 1$. In this case, we select one P_2-fragment F of G and consider the set $S^* = S \cup \{x_F\}$. Since $\{x, x_F\} \subset S^*$, we note that S^* is a DTD-set of G. Further, $|S^*| = k_2 + 2k_3 + 2 + \gamma_t^d(F_w) \leq k_2 + 2k_3 + 2 + 4|V(F_w)|/7$. Since $n = 3k_2 + 4k_3 + 3 + |V(F_w)|$, we have that $4n/7 \geq k_2 + 2k_3 + 2 + 4|V(F_w)|/7 + (5k_2 + 2k_3 - 2)/7 \geq |S^*| + (5k_2 + 2k_3 - 2)/7$. Since $k_2 \geq 1$ and $k_3 \geq 0$, we note that $5k_2 + 2k_3 - 2 > 0$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S^*| < 4n/7$. □

By Claim E, we may assume that $k_2 = 0$.

Claim F *If $k_3 \geq 2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose that $k_3 \geq 2$. In this case, the set S is a DTD-set of G. Further, $|S| = 2k_3 + 1 + \gamma_t^d(F_w) \leq 2k_3 + 1 + 4|V(F_w)|/7$. Since $n = 4k_3 + 3 + |V(F_w)|$, we have that $4n/7 \geq 2k_3 + 1 + 4|V(F_w)|/7 + (2k_3 + 5)/7 > 2k_3 + 1 + 4|V(F_w)|/7 \geq |S| \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| < 4n/7$. □

By Claim F, we may assume that $k_3 \leq 1$.

Claim G *If $k_3 = 1$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.*

Proof. Suppose that $k_3 = 1$ and consider the P_3-fragment F of G. For notational convenience, let $z = x_F$ and let F_z denote this fragment F. Then, $G[V(F_z) \cup \{z\}]$ is a path P_4. Let $z_1z_2z_3z_4$ denote this path, where $z = z_1$. We now consider the graph $G^* = G - \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$. We note that $V(G^*) = V(F_w) \cup \{w, x, y\}$. Further since $F_w \notin \mathcal{E}$, we note that $|V(F_w)| \geq 4$ and therefore $|V(G^*)| \geq 7$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to G^*, we have that either $G^* = G_3$ or $\gamma_t^d(G^*) \leq 4|V(G^*)|/7$.

Suppose $G^* = G_3$. Let $V(G^*) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3, c_1, c_2, c_3, d\}$, where d is the central vertex of G^*, and for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{a_i, b_i, c_i\}$ is the set of three vertices at distance i from d in G^*. Further, $a_1a_2a_3$, $b_1b_2b_3$ and $c_1c_2c_3$ are paths and a_1 and b_1 are adjacent. In the graph G^*, we note that yxw is a path where $d(y) = 1$ and $d(x) = 2$. Thus renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that either $y = a_3$ (in which case $x = a_2$ and $w = a_1$) or $y = c_3$ (in which case $x = c_2$ and $w = c_1$). If $y = a_3$, then let $S^* = \{a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, z_2, z_3\}$. If $y = c_3$, then let $S^* = \{a_1, a_2, b_2, c_2, d, z_2, z_3\}$. In both cases, S^* is a DTD-set of G and $|S^*| = 7$. Thus in this case, we have that $n = 14$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S^*| = n/2 < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that $G^* \neq G_3$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ as desired.

Since $G^* \neq G_3$, we therefore have that $G^* \notin \mathcal{E}$, and therefore by the inductive hypothesis that $\gamma_t^d(G^*) \leq 4|V(G^*)|/7$. Every $\gamma_t^d(G^*)$ can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertices z_2 and z_3, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(G^*)+2 \leq 4|V(G^*)|/7+2 = 4(n-4)/7+2 < 4n/7$. □

By Claim G, we may assume that $k_3 = 0$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ and we are done. This implies that $d_G(x) = 2$ and $N_G(x) = \{y, w\}$. Further, $V(G) = V(F_w) \cup \{w, x, y\}$. Since $n \geq 12$, we note that $|V(F_w)| \geq 9$. Since $F_w \notin \mathcal{E}$, we also note that $F_w \neq G_3$. We may assume in what follows that every support vertex has degree 2, for otherwise we can choose the support vertex x to have degree at least 3 and by the above arguments we would be done. The formal statement follows.

Claim H *Every support vertex in G has degree 2.*

To simplify the notation in what follows, we now rename the vertex y by z, the vertex x by y, and the vertex w by x. Hence, zyx is a path in G (corresponding to the previous path yxw), where z is a leaf of G with neighbor y of degree 2 in G. As before we define $X = N[x] \setminus \{y\}$ and note by the claw-freeness of G that the set X is a clique.

We now consider the components of $G_X = G - (X \cup \{y, z\})$. Following our earlier notation, we call each such component a fragment of G_X. A fragment isomorphic to a graph F, we again call an F-fragment. As before for each fragment F we choose a vertex $x_F \in X$ that is adjacent to a vertex of F. If w is a chosen vertex in X associated with a fragment F, then we denote the fragment F by F_w.

Suppose that F is a P_1-fragment of G_X, where $V(F) = \{u\}$. Then, $N(u) \subseteq X \setminus \{x\}$. Suppose $d_G(u) = 1$. Then, x_F is a support vertex with leaf-neighbor u. By Claim H, the vertex x_F has degree 2 in G. But this implies that u and x are the two neighbors of x_F, and therefore that $|X| = 2$. This in turn implies that $d_G(x) = 2$ and that G is a path P_5,

a contradiction. Hence, $|N(u)| = d_G(u) \geq 2$. By the claw-freeness of G, every vertex in X is adjacent to vertices from at most one fragment. Hence we can uniquely associate the set $N(u)$ with the fragment F.

As before, let X_1 be those vertices in X that are not one of the chosen vertices, x_F, where $F \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus if $v \in X_1$, then either v is not a chosen vertex associated with a fragment or $v = x_F$ for some fragment F, where $F \notin \mathcal{E}$. Let Y be the set consisting of the vertices of the P_1-fragments together with the set $X_1 \cup \{x, y, z\}$. In particular, we note that $|Y| \geq 3$.

We now apply Algorithm A to the graph G_X, except we modify the algorithm slightly as follows. In Step 1 and Step 2, we add to S the vertices x and y. All other steps in the algorithm remain unchanged, except that we add one additional step, namely Step 10 which states that if $F = P_1$, then add x_F to S. We call the resulting modified algorithm, Algorithm B.

Claim I *If $|Y| \geq 4$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ or $G \in \mathcal{H}$ or $G = L_{13} \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|Y| \geq 4$. Then, $|X_1| \geq 1$. By construction the set S has cardinality strictly less than $4n/7$. Further the set S is a DTD-set of G unless $S \cap X = \{x\}$ and there is a P_2-fragment F with exactly one vertex adjacent to x_F. Hence, we may assume that $S \cap X = \{x\}$ and that there is a P_2-fragment F with exactly one vertex adjacent to x_F, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| < 4n/7$. In particular, we note that there is no fragment F with $x_F \in S$. Thus, if F is a fragment in G_X and $F \in \mathcal{E}$, then F is either a P_2-fragment or a P_3-fragment or a P_6-fragment, while if F is a fragment in G_X and $F \notin \mathcal{E}$, then $F \neq P_1$, and so $|V(F)| \geq 4$. Further if F is a P_2-fragment, then exactly one vertex of F is adjacent to x_F; if F is a P_3-fragment, then a leaf, but no other vertex, of F is adjacent to x_F; if F is a P_6-fragment, then x_F is adjacent to a support vertex, but not a leaf, of F.

We now consider a P_2-fragment F. As observed earlier, exactly one vertex of F is adjacent to x_F. Let $x_F = x_1$ and let $F_1 = F$. Further let $V(F_1) = \{y_1, z_1\}$ where $x_1y_1z_1$ is a path. Suppose z_1 is not a leaf in G. Then, z_1 is adjacent to a vertex $x_2 \in X$, where $x_2 \neq x_1$. By the claw-freeness of G, we can uniquely associate $\{x_1, x_2\}$ with the P_2-fragment F. In this case, replacing the vertex y_1 in S with the two vertices x_1 and x_2 produces a DTD-set of G of cardinality strictly less than $4n/7$. Hence we may assume that z_1 is a leaf in G, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$. By Claim H, the support vertex y_1 therefore has degree 2 in G. Let w be an arbitrary vertex in X_1 and let $T = S \cup \{w\}$. Then, T is a DTD-set of G.

Let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 denote the number of P_2-, P_3-, and P_6-fragments in G, respectively. Let F_X be the disjoint union of all fragments in G_X that do not belong to $\mathcal{E}$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to each component of F_X, we have that $\gamma_t^d(F_X) \leq 4|V(F_X)|/7$. Thus, $|T| = 3 + \ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3\ell_3 + \gamma_t^d(F_X) \leq 3 + \ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3\ell_3 + 4|V(F_X)|/7$. Since $\ell_1 \geq 1$, $\ell_2 \geq 0$ and $\ell_3 \geq 0$, we note that $(5\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 - 5)/7 + \ell_3 \geq 0$, with equality if and only if $\ell_1 = 1$ and $\ell_2 = \ell_3 = 0$. Recall that $|Y| \geq 4$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 4n/7 &= 4(3\ell_1 + 4\ell_2 + 7\ell_3 + |Y| + |V(F_X)|)/7 \\ &\geq 4(3\ell_1 + 4\ell_2 + 7\ell_3 + 4 + |V(F_X)|)/7 \\ &= (3 + \ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3\ell_3 + 4|V(F_X)|/7) + (5\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 - 5)/7 + \ell_3 \\ &\geq |T| + (5\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 - 5)/7 + \ell_3 \\ &\geq |T| \\ &\geq \gamma_t^d(G). \end{aligned}$$

If $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$, then there is noting left to prove. Hence we may assume that $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4n/7$. This implies that we have equality throughout the above inequality chain. Hence, $|Y| = 4$, and so $Y = \{w, x, y, z\}$ and $X_1 = \{w\}$. Further, $\ell_1 = 1$, $\ell_2 = \ell_3 = 0$, $\gamma_t^d(F_X) = 4|V(F_X)|/7$, and $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. Thus, F_1 is the only fragment in $\mathcal{E}$, implying that $d_G(x) = 3$ and $N_G(x) = \{x_1, y, w\}$. Since $|X_1| = 1$, there is at most one fragment in G_X not in $\mathcal{E}$. However since $n \geq 12$, there is at least one fragment in G_X not in $\mathcal{E}$. Consequently, there is exactly one fragment F in G_X not in $\mathcal{E}$ and $x_F = w$. We note that $F = F_X$ and $\gamma_t^d(F) = 4|V(F)|/7$. Let $H = G - V(F_w)$ and note that $H = H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $V(H) = \{w, x, x_1, y, y_1, z, z_1\}$, where w is the central vertex of H with neighbors x and x_1 that are adjacent and where xyz and $x_1y_1z_1$ are paths emanating from x and x_1, respectively. Recall that $\{w, x, y, y_1\} \subset T$.

As observed earlier, $\gamma_t^d(F) = 4|V(F)|/7$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to F, we have that $F \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{S}$. We proceed further with the following two subclaims. Recall that by our earlier assumption, $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| = 4n/7$. Further recall that $T = S \cup \{w\}$ and that $\{x, y, y_1\} \subset T$.

Claim I.1 *If $F \in \mathcal{H}$, then $G \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Suppose $F \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, $F = H_t$ for some $t \geq 1$. Let v be an arbitrary vertex of the complete graph K_t used to construct F and let H_v denote the copy of H_1 that contains v. Let $V(H_v) = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, v, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, where vu_1v_1 is the triangle in H_1 and where $u_1u_2u_3$ and $v_1v_2v_3$ are paths in H_v. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that the vertex w is adjacent to at least one vertex in $V(H_v)$ in G. Recall that $S \cap V(F)$ was chosen to be an arbitrary $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set. We may assume that $S \cap V(F)$ consists of the support vertices of F and the neighbors of the support vertices that are not leaves. In particular, we note that $\{u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2\} \subseteq S$.

Suppose that w is adjacent to u_3 or v_3, say to v_3 by symmetry. Then, $T \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. Hence, w is not adjacent to a leaf of H_v in G. By Claim H, this implies that both u_2 and v_2 have degree 2 in G and are therefore not adjacent to w. Suppose that w is adjacent to u_1 or v_1, say to v_1 by symmetry. By the claw-freeness of G, we have that w is adjacent to v and to u_1. But then $T \setminus \{v_1\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the minimality of T. Hence, the vertex v is the only vertex of

H_v adjacent to w. By the claw-freeness of G, this implies that w is adjacent to every vertex of the complete graph K_t used to construct F. But then $G = H_{t+1} \in \mathcal{H}$. This completes the proof of Claim I.1. (□)

Claim I.2 *If $F \in \mathcal{S}$, then $G = L_{13} \in \mathcal{S}$ or $G = H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{S}$, where we recall that $\mathcal{S} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, L_5, L_6, L_{10}, L_{13}, L_{14}\}$. We consider each of the eight possibilities for F in turn. Let $A = \{w, x, y, y_1\}$ and let $B = S \cap V(F)$. Then, B is a $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set and $|B| = 4|V(F)|/7$. Further, $T = A \cup B$. We note that if $F \in \mathcal{S}_1 = \{L_1, L_2, L_3, L_5, L_6, L_{10}\}$, then $|V(F)| = 7$ and $|B| = 4$.

Suppose that $F = L_1$. Let F be the path $v_1v_2 \ldots v_7$. Suppose that w is adjacent to v_1 or v_7, say to v_1 by symmetry. Then, $(T \setminus B) \cup \{v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. Hence, w is not adjacent to a leaf of F in G. Thus both leaves of F are leaves in G. By Claim H, this implies that both v_2 and v_6 have degree 2 in G and are therefore not adjacent to w. By the claw-freeness of G, the vertex w is adjacent to at least one of v_3 and v_5. By symmetry, we may assume that w is adjacent to v_3. By the claw-freeness of G, we have that w is adjacent to v_4. If w is also adjacent to v_5, then $(T \setminus B) \cup \{v_2, v_4, v_6\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. Hence, in this case w is not adjacent to v_5. But then the graph G is determined and $G = L_{13} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Suppose that $F = L_2$. Let $V(F) = \{v, a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ where v is the central vertex of F and for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{a_i, b_i\}$ denotes the pair of vertices at distance i from v in F, with $a_1a_2a_3$ and $b_1b_2b_3$ as paths and a_1 adjacent to b_1. Suppose that w is adjacent to a_3 or b_3, say to a_3 by symmetry. Then, $(T \setminus B) \cup \{v, b_1, b_2\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. Hence, w is not adjacent to a leaf of F in G. Thus both leaves of F are leaves in G. By Claim H, this implies that both a_2 and b_2 have degree 2 in G and are therefore not adjacent to w. Suppose that w is adjacent to a_1 or b_1, say to a_1 by symmetry. By the claw-freeness of G, we have then that w is adjacent to both v and b_1. Then, $(T \setminus B) \cup \{v, a_2, b_2\}$ is a DTD-set of G, a contradiction. Thus, v is the only vertex of F adjacent to w in G, implying that $G = H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$.

Suppose that $F = L_3$. Let $V(F) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, v\}$, where F is obtained from the path $a_1a_2 \ldots a_6$ by adding a new vertex v and adding the edges va_4 and va_5. If w is adjacent to a_1, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{v, a_4\}$. If w is adjacent to both a_3 and a_4, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{v, a_2, a_4\}$. In all other cases (noting by Claim H that if a_1 is a leaf of G, then a_2 is not adjacent to w), let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_2, a_3, a_5\}$. Then, D is a DTD-set of G with $|D| < |T|$, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$.

Suppose that $F = L_5$. Let F be obtained from the path $a_1a_2 \ldots a_7$ by adding the edge a_5a_7. If w is adjacent to a_1, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_4, a_5\}$. If w is adjacent to both a_3 and a_4, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_2, a_4, a_5\}$. In all other cases (noting by Claim H that if a_1 is a leaf of G, then a_2 is not adjacent to w), let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_2, a_3, a_5\}$. Then, D is a DTD-set of G with $|D| < |T|$, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$.

Suppose that $F = L_6$. Let $V(F) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, where F is obtained from the path $a_1a_2a_3v_1v_2v_3v_4$ by adding the edges v_1v_4 and v_2v_4. If w is adjacent to a_1, let

$D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{v_1, v_2\}$. If w is adjacent to both a_3 and v_1, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_2, v_1, v_2\}$. In all other cases, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup \{a_2, a_3, v_1\}$. Then, D is a DTD-set of G with $|D| < |T|$, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$.

Suppose that $F = L_{10}$. Let F be the cycle $v_1v_2 \ldots v_7v_1$. By the claw-freeness of G, the vertex w is adjacent to two consecutive vertices on the cycle F. Renaming vertices, if necessary, we may assume that w is adjacent to v_1 and v_2. Then, $(T \setminus B) \cup \{v_4, v_5\}$ is a DTD-set of G, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$.

Suppose that $F = L_{13}$. Let F be obtained from the disjoint union of the paths $a_1a_2 \ldots a_7$ and $b_1b_2 \ldots b_6$ by adding a new vertex v and joining v to a_3, a_4, b_3 and b_4. Let $S_F = \{a_2, a_3, a_5, a_6, b_2, b_3, b_5, v\}$ and note that $|S_F| = 8 = |B| = 4|V(F)|/7$. If w is adjacent to a_1, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_2, a_3\})$. If w is adjacent to a_7, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_3, a_5, a_6\}) \cup \{a_4\}$. If w is adjacent to a_5, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_5\})$. If w is adjacent to a_3, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_3\})$. If w is adjacent to b_1 or b_6, say to b_6 by symmetry, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{b_5\})$. If w is adjacent to b_3 or b_4, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{b_3\})$. By the claw-freeness of G and by Claim H, this exhausts all possibilities. In all cases, D is a DTD-set of G with $|D| < |T|$, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$.

Suppose that $F = L_{14}$. Let F be obtained from the disjoint union of the paths $a_1a_2 \ldots a_7$ and $b_1b_2 \ldots b_7$ by forming a clique on the set $\{a_3, a_4, b_3, b_4\}$. Let $S_F = \{a_2, a_3, a_5, a_6, b_2, b_3, b_5, b_6\}$ and note that $|S_F| = 8 = |B| = 4|V(F)|/7$. If w is adjacent to a_7 or b_7, say to a_7 by symmetry, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_6\})$. If w is adjacent to a_1 or b_1, say to a_1 by symmetry, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_2\})$. If w is adjacent to a_5 or b_5, say to a_5 by symmetry, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_3, a_5\}) \cup \{a_4\}$. If w is adjacent to a_3 or b_3, say to a_3 by symmetry, let $D = (T \setminus B) \cup (S_F \setminus \{a_3\})$. By the claw-freeness of G and by Claim H, this exhausts all possibilities. In all cases, D is a DTD-set of G with $|D| < |T|$, contradicting the fact that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T|$. This completes the proof of Claim I.2. (□)

Claim I now follows from Claim I.1 and Claim I.2. □

By Claim I, we may assume that $|Y| = 3$, for otherwise the desired result follows. Hence, $Y = \{x, y, z\}$, implying that every vertex in $X \setminus \{x\}$ is associated with a fragment F where $F \in \mathcal{E}$. Recall that the set S is obtained by Algorithm B (as explained in the paragraph immediately preceding Claim I) and $\{x, y\} \subset S$. Recall that $n \geq 12$. If $|S \cap X| \geq 3$, then the set $S \setminus \{x\}$ is a DTD-set of G and by construction, $|S \setminus \{x\}| < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that $|S \cap X| \leq 2$.

Claim J *If $|S \cap X| = 2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$ or $G \in \{L_{13}, L_{14}\} \subset \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|S \cap X| = 2$. Then the set S is a DTD-set of G. Let x' be the vertex in $S \cap X$ different from x and let F be the fragment associated with the vertex x', and so $x' = x_F$. Let $S_F = S \cap V(F)$. Since x_F is the only vertex of $X \setminus \{x\}$ that belongs to S, we note that if L is a fragment in G_X different from F, then either L is a P_2-fragment with exactly one vertex of L adjacent to x_L or L is a P_3-fragment with a leaf, but no other vertex, of L adjacent to x_L or L is a P_6-fragment and x_L is adjacent to a support vertex,

but not a leaf, of L. However by Claim H, every support vertex in G has degree 2, implying that there is no P_6-fragment.

Suppose that $F = G_3$ and let F be described as in Step 9 of Algorithm A. If $|X| \geq 3$, then $|S| < 4n/7$. Therefore we may assume in this case that $X = \{x, x_F\}$, and so $V(G) = \{x, y, z\} \cup V(F)$ and $n = 14$. If S_F is constructed in Step 9.1 of Algorithm A, let $T = (S \setminus \{x_F, w_3\}) \cup \{w_1\}$. If S_F is constructed in Step 9.2, let $T = (S \setminus \{u_3, v_1, x_F\}) \cup \{u_1, w\}$. By Claim H, we note that S_F cannot be constructed in Step 9.3 or Step 9.4. If S_F is constructed in Step 9.5.1, then x_F is adjacent to both w and w_1. By the claw-freeness of G, we note that in this case, x_F is adjacent to neither u_1 nor v_1, and so $G = L_{13} \in \mathcal{S}$. If S_F is constructed in Step 9.5.2, then $G = L_{14} \in \mathcal{S}$. In all cases, either $G \in \{L_{13}, L_{14}\}$ or $G \notin \{L_{13}, L_{14}\}$ and the constructed set T is a DTD-set of G with $|T| \leq 7 < 4n/7$. Hence in what follows we may assume that $F \neq G_3$, for otherwise the desired result follows. If there is a fragment L, different from F, such that $L = G_3$, then by Algorithm A we note that $x_L \in S$, a contradiction since $S \cap X = \{x, x_F\}$ and $x_L \neq x_F$. Hence there is no fragment isomorphic to G_3.

If S_F is not constructed in Step 8.3 of Algorithm A, then $|S| < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that S_F is constructed in Step 8.3 of Algorithm A. In particular, we note that $S_F = \{v_2, v_4, v_5, x_F\}$ and $|S_F| = 4 = 4|V(F)|/7$. Since $n \geq 12$, there are at least two fragments. Let L be a fragment different from F and let $S_L = S \cap V(L)$. If there are three or more fragments, or if F and L are the only two fragments but S_L is not constructed as in Step 5.2 of Algorithm A, then $|S| < 4n/7$. Hence we may assume that F and L are the only two fragments and that L is a P_3-fragment with a leaf, but no other vertex, of L adjacent to x_L. This implies that $G = L_{13} \in \mathcal{S}$. □

Recall that since $|Y| = 3$, every vertex in $X \setminus \{x\}$ is associated with a fragment F where $F \in \mathcal{E}$. By Claim J, we may assume that $S \cap X = \{x\}$, and so for every fragment F we have $x_F \notin S$. This implies that if F is a fragment in G_X, then either F is a P_2-fragment with exactly one vertex of F adjacent to x_L (see Step 4.2 in Algorithm A) or F is a P_3-fragment with a leaf, but no other vertex, of F adjacent to x_F (see Step 5.2 in Algorithm A) or F is a P_6-fragment and x_F is adjacent to a support vertex, but not a leaf, of F (see Step 8.2 in Algorithm A). However by Claim H, every support vertex in G has degree 2, implying that there is no P_6-fragment.

Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 denote the number of P_2- and P_3-fragments in G, respectively. Since $n \geq 12$, we note that $\ell_1 + \ell_2 \geq 3$. Further, $n = 3\ell_1 + 4\ell_2 + 3$. Let w be an arbitrary vertex from the set $X \setminus \{x\}$ and let $S^* = S \cup \{w\}$. We note that the set S^* is a DTD-set of G and $|S^*| = \ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3$.

Suppose $\ell_1 = 0$. Then the set S is a DTD-set of G and $\ell_2 \geq 3$. Further, $|S| = 2\ell_2 + 2$ and $4n/7 = 4(4\ell_2 + 3)/7 = (2\ell_2 + 2) + (2\ell_2 - 2)/7 \geq |S| + 4/7 > |S| \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence we may assume that $\ell_1 \geq 1$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.

Suppose $\ell_1 \geq 2$. Then, $4n/7 = 4(3\ell_1 + 4\ell_2 + 3)/7 = (\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3) + (5\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 - 9)/7 \geq |S^*| + 3/7 > |S^*| \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence we may assume that $\ell_1 = 1$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.

Since $\ell_1 = 1$ and $\ell_1 + \ell_2 \geq 3$, we note that $\ell_2 \geq 2$. Suppose $\ell_2 \geq 3$. Then, $4n/7 = 4(3\ell_1 + 4\ell_2 + 3)/7 = (\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 3) + (5\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 - 9)/7 \geq |S^*| + 2/7 > |S^*| \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence we may assume that $\ell_2 = 2$, for otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < 4n/7$.

Since $\ell_1 = 1$ and $\ell_2 = 2$, we have that $G = L_{14} \in \mathcal{S}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 7. □

References

[1] R. C. Brigham, J. R. Carrington, and R. P. Vitray, Connected graphs with maximum total domination number. *J. Combin. Comput. Combin. Math.* **34** (2000), 81–96.

[2] E. J. Cockayne, R. M. Dawes, and S. T. Hedetniemi, Total domination in graphs. *Networks* **10** (1980), 211–219.

[3] O. Favaron and M. A. Henning, Upper total domination in claw-free graphs. *J. Graph Theory* **44** (2003), 148–158.

[4] O. Favaron and M. A. Henning, Paired domination in claw-free cubic graphs. *Graphs Combin.* **20** (2004), 447–456.

[5] O. Favaron and M. A. Henning, Total domination in claw-free graphs with minimum degree two. *Discrete Math.* **308** (2008), 3213–3219.

[6] O. Favaron and M. A. Henning, Bounds on total domination in claw-free cubic graphs. *Discrete Mathematics* **308** (2008), 3491–3507.

[7] W. Goddard, M. A. Henning and C. A. Pilman, The disjunctive domination number of a graph. To appear in *Quaestiones Mathematicae*.

[8] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[9] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater (eds), *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[10] M. A. Henning, Graphs with large total domination number. *J. Graph Theory* **35** (2000), 21–45.

[11] M. A. Henning, Recent results on total domination in graphs: A survey. *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009), 32–63.

[12] M. A. Henning and V. Naicker, Graphs with large disjunctive total domination number, manuscript.

[13] M. A. Henning and A. Yeo, *Total domination in graphs (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)* 2013. ISBN: 978-1-4614-6524-9 (Print) 978-1-4614-6525-6 (Online).

[14] M. A. Henning and A. Yeo, Total domination in claw-free graphs. *Total domination in graphs (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)* 2013, 71–75.

[15] J. Southey and M. A. Henning, On a conjecture on total domination in claw-free cubic graphs. *Discrete Mathematics* **310** (2010), 2984–2999.

[16] N. Lichiardopol, On a conjecture on total domination in claw-free cubic graphs: proof and new upper bound. *Australas. J. Combin.* **51** (2011), 7–28.